	Case 3:07-cv-00114-JCM-VPC Document 19 Filed 07/07/10 Page 1 of 2
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8	DISTRICT OF NEVADA
9	DANIEL THOMACHADVEY
10	DANIEL THOMAS HARVEY,) Petitioner,) 3:07-cv-00114-JCM-VPC
11)
12 13	vs.) ORDER) GEORGE J. CHANOS, et al.,
13)
15	Respondents.)
16	On November 20, 2008, the court entered an order dismissing the habeas corpus
17	petition in this case (docket #16). Judgment was entered on the same day (docket #17).
18	Subsequently, petitioner filed a notice of appeal (docket #18). Petitioner has not filed
19	a motion for certificate of appealability, and the matter is stalled. Thus, the court will <i>sua sponte</i>
20	address the issue to allow the court of appeals to proceed on the matter.
21	Certificate of Appealability
22	In order to proceed with his appeal, petitioner must receive a certificate of
23	appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1); Fed. R. App. P. 22; 9 th Cir. R. 22-1; <i>Allen v. Ornoski</i> , 435
24	F.3d 946, 950-951 (9 th Cir. 2006); see also United States v. Mikels, 236 F.3d 550, 551-52 (9th Cir.
25	2001). Generally, a petitioner must make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional
26	right" to warrant a certificate of appealability. <i>Id.</i> ; 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); <i>Slack v. McDaniel</i> , 529

U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000). "The petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Id. (quoting Slack, 529 U.S. at 484). In order to meet this threshold inquiry, the petitioner has the burden of demonstrating that the issues are debatable among jurists of reason; that a court could resolve the issues differently; or that the questions are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Id.* This court has considered the issues raised by petitioner, with respect to whether they satisfy the standard for issuance of a certificate of appealability, and determines that none meet that standard. The court will therefore deny petitioner a certificate of appealability. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED petitioner shall not be granted a certificate of appealability. Dated this 7th day of July, 2010. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE